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# Spec Theory

## Super-Spec Shell

**Interpretation:** The aff must have a text in the AC specifying one or more just governments that ought to require employers pay a living wage, along with a specific method of calculation of that living wage.

**Standards:**

1. **Ground**: Speccing place and mechanism is critical to the distribution of ground – determines what impacts apply. **Zipperer and Price ‘14[[1]](#footnote-1)**

How do employment effects vary by the size of the minimum wage increase? While recent research suggests that modest increases in the minimum have strong effects on earnings and small effects on employment, little work exists on whether this pattern holds for larger raises. Economic theory suggests that the effects will vary by the “bite” of the minimum wage into the underlying wage or productivity distribution. In a study of the 1996 and 1997 federal minimum wage changes, Economist Jeffrey P. Thompson— now at the Federal Reserve Board and previously a professor at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, found that in 2009, counties with low average earnings (where the minimum’s “bite” was greater) had larger falls in employment after the wage change. Offering an international perspective on the debate, economists Yi Huang, Prakash Loungani, and Gewei Wang estimated that after China strengthened minimum wage enforcement, firms with low profit margins reduced employment, but firms with high profit margins expanded.

Indicates specification of both place and calculation method are key to determine the size of the employment effects and distribution – areas with low-profit industries can get me larger DAs, for example. Impacts:

**A. Tradeoff ground** – unintentional harms are place-specific, but are the core of neg ground: the idea of a living wage seems good and no one just says “we should pay poverty wages,” the problem is the specific tradeoffs each country has to make that can’t be seen in the abstract.

**B. Kills Solvency Deficits** - different realized consequences based on policy specifics mean I can’t challenge them without knowing where they implement it. Economic fundamentals determine my access to those args. Especially key because terminal impact scenarios are scientific questions so I need to be able to make link takeouts to poverty scenarios.

**C.** They stop the neg from reading a consequentialist framework since I can’t make coherent arguments without specifics. Intentions of a policy are always good so I need util as an option – otherwise the aff always wins.

Having the neg spec for you doesn’t work since the neg will always pick something unreasonable that will give them the win, so it’s a bad norm. Also kills phil ed since it limits the philosophies we can learn about.

2. **Debatability**: The meaning of a living wage varies by country, methodological differences mean they’re incomparable. **Guzi ‘13[[2]](#footnote-2)**

The income level necessary to secure a decent standard of living is an important economic yardstick of income adequacy. A living wage is defined as a wage paid for a standard working week that meets the basic needs of workers and their families and provides some discretionary income. The need for a living wage has also been recognized by the international community. In 1919 the International Labor Organization (ILO) has defined a living wage as a basic human right under their conventions and recommendations to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 23 (ILO, 2008). In 1948 the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights officially recognized the need for workers to receive a living wage. There was never a consensus on how to define a living wage but in the recent decades governments, municipalities, international and local trade unions, and labor research institutes developed their own definitions and measurement methods of a living wage. Debates have appeared in different fora about how best to calculate this standard in a given context. Anker (2011) is the most comprehensive review on how the living wage has been described, defined and measured around the world. In many countries, the concept of living wage is based on a number of different definitions. Different methodological approaches make it difficult to produce a globally comparable living wage. Moreover, the estimation of living wage hinges on the availability of timely information about the cost of living, which is seldom available in developing countries. Anker (2011) argues that greater clarity with regards to the definition and measurement of living wage is a prerequisite for the widespread consideration of living wages and employee needs, by companies, unions and governments.

The evidence says there is no consistent meaning of a living wage. Prefer it to analytics – it’s a neutral 3rd party taking a stance – debaters always have an incentive to make topic claims to win a ballot.

Not specing makes the debate irresolvable since if the aff is winning under one nation’s conception of a living wage and the neg is winning under a different conception there’s no way for the judge to determine who wins. Speccing solves since we know which nation’s conception we’re talking about.

Resolvibility key since every debate needs a winner. Debatability is key to fairness and education and outweighs other standards because whether your interpretation is best for fairness or education is irrelevant if we can’t access that interp inround.

**Controls the internal link to topic lit -** best topic literature is in the context of specific instances, and without spec we’re equivocating between different policies without access to the best arguments. That outweighs other impacts – makes our discussions of the topic make sense to experts so the knowledge has value.

**And**, “You get access to more studies” or “I won’t delink DAs” are nonresponsive – we just speak past each other because we’re not referring to the same policy and our debates are literally incoherent, since we’re indicting and defending different policies.

**3. Policy Education:** 90% of policymaking is mechanisms rather than pure analysis. **Elmore[[3]](#footnote-3)**

The emergence of implementation as a subject for policy analysis coincides closely with the discovery by policy analysts that decisions are not self-executing. Analysis of policy choices matters very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood. In answering the question, "What percentage of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done when the preferred analytic alternative has been identified?" Allison estimated that, in the normal case, it was about 10 percent, leaving the remaining 90 percent in the realm of implementation. Hence, in Nelson's terms, "the core of analysis of alternatives becomes the prediction of how alternative organizational structures will behave over . .. time." But the task of prediction is vastly complicated by the absence of a coherent body of organizational theory, making it necessary to posit several alternative models of organization.

Their aff avoids all questions of implementation and instead focuses on the macro-level idea of living wage laws, killing policy making education. Policy making education is uniquely key **Keller**:[[4]](#footnote-4)

Policy practice encompasses social workers' "efforts to influence the development, enactment, implementation, or assessment of social policies" (Jansson, 1994, p. 8). Effective policy practice involves analytic activities, such as defining issues, gathering data, conducting research, identifying and prioritizing policy options, and creating policy proposals (Jansson, 1994). It also involves persuasive activities intended to influence opinions and outcomes, such as discussing and debating issues, organizing coalitions and task forces, and providing testimony. According to Jansson (1984, pp. 57-58), social workers rely upon five fundamental skills when pursuing policy practice activities:  \* value-clarification skills for identifying and assessing the underlying values inherent in policy positions;  \* conceptual skills for identifying and evaluating the relative merits of different policy options;  \* interactional skills for interpreting the values and positions of others and conveying one's own point of view in a convincing manner;  \* political skills for developing coalitions and developing effective strategies; and  \* position-taking skills for recommending, advocating, and defending a particular policy. These policy practice skills reflect the hallmarks of critical thinking (see Brookfield, 1987; Gambrill, 1997). The central activities of critical thinking are identifying and challenging underlying assumptions, exploring alternative[s] ways of thinking and acting, and arriving at commitments after a period of questioning, analysis, and reflection (Brookfield, 1987). Significant parallels exist with the policy-making process--identifying the values underlying policy choices, recognizing and evaluating multiple alternatives, and taking a position and advocating for its adoption. Developing policy practice skills seems to share[s] much in common with developing capacities for critical thinking.

And, cx doesn’t check.

1. An AC advocacy text is better because we can hold you to it, whereas we don’t have a CX exchange memorized.

2. Skews my CX time-he can stall me in cx taking a lot of time clarifying. CX time is key bc you need it to clarify the aff.

3. By specing implementation in the AC we get policy making education for the whole round, otherwise we don’t get it for the first few minutes of the ro d.

4. Judges don’t pay us much attention in cx as they do in speeches, so its clearer if he defends implementation in the aff.

5. Allowing him to change his advocacy in cross-x is bad-it allows him to be abusive in the NC at no risk and hope I don’t catch on to the abuse.

6. Topic specific theory debates are good a) understanding what the words in the topic mean is a prerequisite to actually debating and understanding the topic b) Theory debates allow us to create norms for future debates to be more fair and educational. Impact turns any argument about cx checks avoiding theory.

## Country Spec

A. **Interpretation**: In the AC, the affirmative must specify one country to require employers pay a living wage.

B. **Violation**: He doesn’t.

C. **Standards**:

1. Ground: a)They remove country-specific ground. That’s uniquely bad for the neg since the idea of a living wage seems good; the problem is the specific tradeoffs each country has to make that can’t be seen in the abstract. This includes politics disads, which are a big reason a living wage hasn’t been passed in the US yet. Politics disads are country specific-so I lose access if you don’ts s[ec.

**B)** I can’t question solvency, that’s also key neg ground since the terminal impact scenarios are scientific questions so I need to be able to make link takeouts. It also explodes aff ground since they can win on chains that aren’t actually justifies. Ground is key to fairness because it determines our ability to make arguments.

1. Topic Lit: I can’t access the topic lit since the majority of it is in the context of specific instances. Access to topic lit is key since those are the best arguments, also key to education since those are what we’ll hear outside a debate context.
2. **Debatibility**: The meaning of a living wage varies by country **Guzi ‘13[[5]](#footnote-5)**

The income level necessary to secure a decent standard of living is an important economic yardstick of income adequacy. **A living wage is** defined as **a wage** paid for a standard working week **that meets the basic needs of workers and their families** and provides some discretionary income. The need for a living wage has also been recognized by the international community. In 1919 the International Labor Organization (ILO) has defined a living wage as a basic human right under their conventions and recommendations to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 23 (ILO, 2008). In 1948 the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights officially recognized the need for workers to receive a living wage. **There was never a consensus on how to define a living wage** but **in** the **recent decades governments**, municipalities, international and local trade unions, and labor research institutes **developed their own definitions and measurement methods of a living wage**. Debates have appeared in different fora about how best to calculate this standard in a given context. Anker (2011) is the most comprehensive review on how the living wage has been described, defined and measured around the world. In many countries, the concept of living wage is based on a number of different definitions. **Different methodological approaches make it difficult to produce a globally comparable living wage**. Moreover, the estimation of living wage hinges on the availability of timely information about the cost of living, which is seldom available in developing countries. Anker (2011) argues that **greater clarity with regards to the definition and measurement of living wage is a prerequisite for the** widespread **consideration of living wages** and employee needs, by companies, unions and governments.

The evidence says there is no consistent meaning of a living wage. This means the topic isn’t debatable in the abstract since we can’t have a debate if we don’t even know what we’re debating about. Prefer this evidence since this is a neutral 3rd party saying that this debate is irresolvable absent spec – Guzi literally says we need to spec- since debaters always have an incentive to make up links into fairness to win a ballot. B) Not specing makes the debate irresolvable since if the aff is winning under one nation’s conception of a living wage and the neg is winning under a different conception there’s no way for the judge to determine who wins. Speccing solves since we know which nation’s conception we’re talking about. Resolvibility key since every debate eeds a winner. Debatability is key to fairness and education and outweighs other standards because whether your interpretation is best for fairness or education is irrelevant if we can’t access that interp inround.

[Frontlines Omitted]

## Can’t Spec

**A-Interpretation:** The resolutional phrasing means it refers to all members of the class. **Nordquist[[6]](#footnote-6)**

Zero article with plural count nouns may have generic or indefinite reference according to the predication: [Statements like] Frogs have long hind legs. [are] (generic [and refer to]= all frogs) He catches frogs. (indefinite = an indefinite number of frogs)

**B-Violation**: The aff specifies government. My interp requires defending the prioritization in all developing countries.

**C-Standards:**

1. **Grammar**: This is the only definition consistent with the resolutional phrasing. Ones that just say “it’s plural” ignore the zero article – if that was actually the intention, it would have said “some developing countries.” Grammar comes first:

**(a)** everyone has access to interpretations of a fixed statement so it generates the most predictable limits which are key to our ability to equally prepare. **(b)** the judge assumes grammar as a precondition for being able to evaluate our speeches and make a decision, resolvability first because its key for the judge to decide the round. **(c)** The text of the resolution controls the internal link to all standards about how we divide ground. “Pigs fly” may be fair ground, but textuality constrains it. **(d)** Theoretical standards are ways of resolving textual interps, but if the interp isn’t textual it doesn’t meet the litmus test for evaluating theory so the rest of the layer is moot – this is an independent voter. **(e)** the text is the stable basis for clash, arbitrary modifications mean I don’t know which parts he’ll defend. Clash is the biggest link to education since we get critical thinking by engaging arguments, which is the only unique advantage to having a round. **(f)** “The better debating” is defined by doing a better job in our roles as debaters, affirm means “**to say that something is true.**”[[7]](#footnote-7) If he hasn’t met the aff burden he hasn’t done the better debating by definition so you can’t vote for him – this is another reason it’s an independent voter.

1. **Division of Ground**: This topic is gigantic, there are almost 200 government, and the possibility of speccing groups makes it even worse, but the aff just needs to prep their country or multinational group. Controls the internal links to predictability and clash: I can’t know what random country they’ll defend so no one actually engages them on substance, merely on framework. Topical education is more important at Harvard: it’s the last big tournament on Jan/Feb for a lot of people. Also, the comparative deficit to topical education outweighs the marginal encouragement of phil ed on strength of link anyway. Division of ground is key to fairness because it determines our ability to impact arguments to the ballot equally.

## T-Plural

**A. Interpretation:** Just governments means more than one government. To clarify, the aff has to advocate more than one government doing the (res or plan) to generate offense. **NALA[[8]](#footnote-8)**

**Plural means more than one** of something. **Most plurals are formed by adding an ‘s’** to the singular, for example, one **shop becomes** two **shops** one **car becomes** ten **cars** These are straightforward. However there are some words that change spelling when ‘s’ is added. This exercise looks at what happens when ‘s’ is added to words that end in the letters ‘y’ For example party + s = parties If you have a problem remembering this, then this exercise is for you! The answers to the exercises are on the last page. Rules about words ending in yTo get the plural of words ending in ‘y’, there is a rule to remember. If there is a vowel before the y, you just add ‘s’. If there is a consonant before the ‘y’, drop the ‘y’ and add ‘ies’

B. Violation; He specs a country.

C. Standards: Grammar: The resolution is plural so you have to defend more than one government to be grammatical. Grammar comes first **(a)** everyone has access to interpretations of a fixed statement so it generates the most predictable limits which are key to our ability to equally prepare. **(b)** the judge assumes grammar as a precondition for being able to evaluate our speeches and make a decision, resolvability first because its key for the judge to decide the round. **(c)** The text of the resolution controls the internal link to all standards about how we divide ground. “Pigs fly” may be fair ground, but textuality constrains it. **(d)** Theoretical standards are ways of resolving textual interps, but if the interp isn’t textual it doesn’t meet the litmus test for evaluating theory so the rest of the layer is moot – this is an independent voter. **(e)** the text is the stable basis for clash, arbitrary modifications mean I don’t know which parts he’ll defend. Clash is the biggest link to education since we get critical thinking by engaging arguments, which is the only unique advantage to having a round. **(f)** “The better debating” is defined by doing a better job in our roles as debaters, affirm means “**to say that something is true.**”[[9]](#footnote-9) If he hasn’t met the aff burden he hasn’t done the better debating by definition so you can’t vote for him – this is another reason it’s an independent voter.

And, we have to be actually debating the resolution, that comes first **Nebel[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**The res**olution **is** stated in English, **not in some** special **debate-specific dialect** of English. **Facts of usage constrain interpretation**. The existential interpretation is not even, as I see it, eligible. So its **pragmatic benefits are irrelevant. Compare: I think it would be better if the res**olution **were, “It is not the case that just governments ought to …” But that’s not the resolution, so it’s not** even an **eligible** interpretation **in a T debate.** (Here I assume a controversial view about whether pragmatic benefits can justify a semantically inadequate interpretation of the resolution. I cannot defend this view here, but I welcome questions and objections in the comments to be addressed in a later article.)

[Frontlines Omitted]

## Must Spec Policy

[I wrote this one, but had to omit it]

## Must Have Demographic Info

A. Interpretation: If the affirmative specifies a country in which to implement a living wage then the affirmative must have available demographic information about that country including, at least, the unemployment rate, the income level, the distribution of employers based on firm size, the productivity of the workforce, and the size of the informal sector.

B. Violation: They don’t.

C. Standards:

First, the efficacy of a minimum wage is dependent on demographics of the country in which it is implemented **Soundararajan ‘13[[11]](#footnote-11)**

The effects of minimum wages on employment and wages are widely debated in the labor economics literature. The efficacy of such regulations in achieving their intended welfare consequences is less straightforward and depends on characteristics such as, income and health of institutions of the country or state in question (Blanchard, 2004). Enforcement intensity is one such institution that is important, but often neglected in the evaluation in empirical labor market studies. This paper argues that the extensive literature on the evaluation of the minimum wage policy does not acknowledge the poor standards of enforcement, despite the growing evidence on the latter. The imperfect nature of enforcement and the effects of spatial and time varying enforcement intensities on wages, employment, firm size, productivity, and informality have been studied in a number of papers on developing countries. However, studies that estimate the joint impact of minimum wages and enforcement are starkly missing. This paper attempts to fill this gap in the literature by estimating an interactive effect of minimum wages and enforcement among low wage construction workers in India using six repeated cross-section datasets from the employment-unemployment survey conducted by the National Sample Survey Organization of India.

Few implications,

1) Resolvability: Since its impossible to tell whether a minimum wage will be effective absent knowing demographics about the nation, you not providing them makes it impossible to resolve the debate about the efficacy of the minimum wage. Reading evidence about the nation you spec doesn’t solve since we can’t resolve whether the claims made in the article are accurate or how it interacts with other evidence. Resolvability is the biggest impact to fairness since no matter how unskewed the debate is, if the judge can’t pick a winner then the better debater won’t be the winner.

2) Ground: You kill neg ground since determining the effect on unemployment is impossible absent knowledge of specifics of the country. This is uniquely affected by the demographics since, for example, if there is currently 1 percent unemployment that probably means it won’t be an issue. Unemployment is core neg ground on the topic, ground key to fairness since it's the basis on which we make arguments.

3) Real world: Absent being able to know the efficacy of the living wage policy its impossible to have an informed debate about the real issues relevant to the country. Also, independent of this evidence, if you don’t give me the information about the country you spec its harder to have an in depth debate about that country since I’m forced to rely on generics, while the real world debate would be based on information about the country you spec. Real world is key to education since it ensures the arguments we make have actual relevance.

**Second,** you giving me this information is key to me knowing what prep applies to the aff. For example, if the country is dominated by big companies than my small business disad probably wouldn’t apply, but I wouldn’t know that. Uniquely key a) there are 200 countries there is no way for me to know the demographics of every single one of them b) For a lot of countries there is literally not a single neg article written, so my only option is generics about the living wage, meaning I need to know which apply. Massively unfair, since I need to use prep to win the round. Also, uneducational since it prevents me from engaging with the literature.

## Enforcement Spec

A. Interpretation: If the affirmative specifies a nation in which to implement a living wage, then the affirmative must specify an enforcement level and mechanism with a solvency advocate defending it specifically in that nation.

B. Violation: They don’t.

C. Standards:

First, the efficacy of a minimum wage is dependent on demographics of the country in which it is implemented **Soundararajan ‘13[[12]](#footnote-12)**

**The effects of minimum wages on employment and wages are widely debated** in the labor economics literature. **The efficacy of such regulations** in achieving their intended welfare consequences is less straightforward and **depends on characteristics such as**, income and health of institutions of the country or state in question (Blanchard, 2004). **Enforcement intensity** is one such institution that is important, but often neglected in the evaluation in empirical labor market studies. This paper argues that the extensive literature on the evaluation of the minimum wage policy does not acknowledge the poor standards of enforcement, despite the growing evidence on the latter. **The imperfect nature of enforcement and the effects of spatial and time varying enforcement intensities on wages, employment, firm size, productivity, and informality have been studied** in a number of papers on developing countries. However, studies that estimate the joint impact of minimum wages and enforcement are starkly missing. This paper attempts to fill this gap in the literature by estimating an interactive effect of minimum wages and enforcement among low wage construction workers in India using six repeated cross-section datasets from the employment-unemployment survey conducted by the National Sample Survey Organization of India. As Hamermesh (2002) notes, developing countries act as a good workroom for policy evaluation, because they provide quasi-experimental research designs. India provides such a platform with minimum wages and enforcement varying exogenously across states and time. Both parametric reduced-form and semi-parametric regression (using splines) results are reported. These findings would not only lend themselves to the understanding the role of minimum wage, but the direction of estimated effects indicate the nature of the underlying labor markets. Theories predict a uniform negative effect of minimum wages on employment in competitive labor markets, and an inverted U-shape relationship in monosponistic and oligospnistic models (Stigler, 1946). Further, **varying levels of enforcement could potentially interact** with varying minimum wages **to produce interesting outcomes**. For instance, Basu, Chau and Kanbur (2010) develop an incentive compatible equilibrium model and define several thresholds, to show that **the response of employment to a minimum wage** rise **can be positive, negative or subdued depending on** the level of minimum wage and **enforcement.**

Few implications,

1) Resolvability: Since its impossible to tell whether a minimum wage will be effective absent knowing how and to what degree it’s enforced, you not providing them makes it impossible to resolve the debate about the efficacy of the minimum wage. If we literally don't know whether it increases or decreases employment, resolving that weighing debate is impossible. Resolvability is the biggest impact to fairness since no matter how unskewed the debate is, if the judge can’t pick a winner then the better debater won’t be the winner.

2) Ground: a) Determining the effect on unemployment is impossible absent knowledge of enforcement, meaning if I read unemployment you can just get up in the 1ar and say you’d enforce it in a way that gets out of unemployment. Unemployment is core neg ground on the topic, it's the biggest arg against a living wage. B) You uniquely harm neg ground since living wage’s seem good in the abstract-they help poor people. However, its problems with their enforcement that provide neg ground. For example, if they are poorly enforced there can be a shift to the informal sector. Ground key to fairness since it's the basis on which we make arguments. C) you kill country specific ground since specific disads are based on problems with enforcing it ina specific nation, but if you don’t spec enforcement there is no way for me to access those disads, since I don’t know which enforcement problems get triggered. Country specific ground is key since otherwise you’re evidence will be more relevant to the plan than my generics. And, having a solvency advocate is key to predictability, if your enforcement mechanism is not defended in the lit, I won’t be able to know it is a possibility. That’s key to fairness since I need to be able to prepare disadvantages to the way in which you implement the plan to win.

3) Real world: Absent specing enforcement of the living wage policy its impossible to have an informed debate about the real implications of a living wage. Moreover, in the real world any policy would have an enforcement mechanism that comes a long with it-no government would pass a policy and not say how they’d enforce it. Also, having a solvency advocate defend your mechanism is uniquely key since it ensures that the enforcement you spec is one that is really being debated. Further, the real world debate is country specific, with specific ways of implementing the plan in each country. By not speccing enforcement, we can’t have that debate specific to the country in which you spec. Real world is key to education since it ensures the arguments we make have actual relevance.

## Must Spec Poverty Metric (Both Sides)

*[Omitted]*

# T-Just Governments

## Multi-actor fiat bad

**A-Interpretation:** The aff may not defend the governments of more than one nation implementing a living wage.

**B-Violation:**

**First**, **real world**: The concept of a single agent being able to control multiple countries is absolutely unheard of, its not something anyone even thinks seriously about when asking “what can we do to solve X problem” – all of them are constrained to a single agent. And, international treaties don't solve since no one actor can ensure that other nations sign those treaties. Key to education since it ensures we are learning about arguments that have actual significance, and controls the internal link into predictability since it definitionally doesn’t exist in the real world. Also, since there are are infinite number of combinations of potential fiats and actors, I could never predict this one. Predictability is key to fairness since it dictates our ability to prepare for the debate. Real world controls the internal link to all literature based arguments: academics aren’t writing for debate so assuming a special notion of what we should talk about in rounds creates a hidden disconnect between how we use terms and how our authors do which is bad.

**ground** a) I lose access to arguments about how a single actor shouldn’t act because they can’t make enough of a difference, args about the difficulty of international cooperation or disadvantages to unilateral action. These are the real arguments people make, so they’re probably some of the best. That he gets to avoid them all means the fiat is utopian which also kills my ground since I don’t get to make indicts of the implementation. B) Core neg ground is outsourcing, its one of the main economic arguments against a living wage. You take that ground away, since a living wage causes outsourcing in the real world due to it not being implemented elsewhere, but by implementing the plan in multiple countries you fiat out of that since labor is no longer cheaper elsewhere.

[Frontlines Ommited]

## Property Rights

**Interpretation:** A “just government” is one that protects individuals right to property. **Thomas cites Madison[[13]](#footnote-13)** bracketed for gendered language

This understanding of what lies at the heart of republican government — and especially the central role of property rights — is well grounded in the American constitutional tradition. James Madison asserted that the purpose of the state was to protect property — "this being the end of government, that alone is a just government, which impartially secures to every[one] man, whatever is [their] his own."

This interpretation is best: **A. Quals**: Madison was well-versed in governing principles, and he was involved in creating one of the first democratic nations of the modern era, he’s best able to define what we’re talking about when we want a government to be just. **B.** **Historical Context**: Use of this definition by a 2014 author indicates that this definition has been in the canon for literally centuries – makes it uniquely predictable and proves that it centers the lit base. **C.** **Term of Art**: uses “just government” as a phrase, rather than applying notions of justice generically, so it’s more likely to capture actual usage in the lit.

## Need Counter-Solvency Advocate if specs just government

A. Interpretation: If the affirmative specifies a nation in which to implement a living wage then the affirmative must be able to identify an author from the topic literature that advocates against a living wage specifically in that nation. To clarify, an author that advocates for a living wage generally or for a living wage in several countries is insufficient to meet the interpretation.

B. Violation:

C. Standards: 1. Ground: A counter-solvency advocate is good litmus test to see if there is lit on both sides of issue. If there is no counter-solvency advocate, then there is no way to verify that there is literature on my side of the issue, meaning my ground is probably awful since if there were good arguments to be made an author would have made them. Ground is key to fairness since it is the basis on which we make arguments. And, This is especially true on this topic since there are some countries where massive exploitation make it almost trivial true that they should implement a living wage. Finally, controls the internal link into topical educations since absent an author advocating against the aff I’m forced to rely on bad generics instead of learning about the topic the way experts actually discuss it. Key to education since we only have the topic for two months.

2. Predictability: a) When debaters search for arguments they look for articles defending their side of the topic. If there aren’t any for the country he defends then I won’t even know that there are arguments to prepare for that country. B) Otherwise you underlimit the topic since there are 200 countries you can defend, making it extremely hard to predict which one you’ll choose. My interp narrows the topic to a more reasonable number since countersolvency advocates only exist for some. Controls the internal link into clash since if there are too many affs I can’t prepare arguments to engage with yours, the biggest link into education since the only unique benefit to having a round is engaging each others arguments. Predictibility is key to fairness since you need to be able to prepare arguments to win.

## More Just (AT Abstract Justice)

**A-Interpretation:** The resolution is a question of what a government ought do in order to be just. To clarify, a just society does not limit the discussion to real world countries that are just while excluding those that are currently unjust.

**B- Violation:**

**C- Standards:**

1. Division of ground: Their division of ground is incoherent because what constitutes a just society is dependent on the moral framework one meaning what is topical changes from round to round. Topicality interps however are supposed to be rules for debate that apply to all rounds. Key to fairness because we need to know what ground we have to prepare arguments. Also kills a) topic education-there is no incentive to actually engage the topic since the neg can always just read a different framework that makes the aff topical. Key to education because we only have the topic for two months and b) clash-without a clear division of ground there is no way for us to prepare arguments in a way to clash with each other. Key to education because we learn from engaging each other’s arguments.

2. Grammar:

Your interp is ungrammatical. If I say a good batter ought hit the ball I am saying that hitting the ball is part of what makes the batter good. I would not say a bad batter ought not hit the ball because he’s bad. Similarly, it doesn’t make sense to say that a government’s justness makes it such that it should implement a living wage. Instead, the only grammatical interp is that the rez is a question of whether a living wage is part of what would make a government just. Grammar is key. a.everyone has access to interpretations of a fixed statement so it generates the most predictable limits which are key to our ability to equally prepare. b. the judge assumes grammar as a precondition for being able to evaluate our speeches and make a decision, resolvability key because its key for the judge to decide the round. cthe text is the stable basis for clash, arbitrary modifications mean I don’t know which parts he’ll defend. Clash is key to education since we get critical thinking by engaging arguments, which is the only unique advantage to having a round

# T-Employer

## All Employers

**A. Interpretation:** The resolutional use of a zero article with plural count noun means it refers to all employers.

**Nordquist[[14]](#footnote-14)**

Zero article with plural count nouns may have generic or indefinite reference according to the predication: [Statements like] Frogs have long hind legs. [are] (generic [and refer to]= all frogs) He catches frogs. (indefinite = an indefinite number of frogs)

**B. Violation:** He specs.

**C. Standards:**

1. Division of Ground: A. This lets the aff pick the subset of employers that is best for the aff, including an industry that avoids the disads that are core neg ground, such as one where firing workers is impossible, muting unemployment disads. B. Core neg econ ground is uniquely dependent on the living wage applying to all employers **Bernstein ‘05[[15]](#footnote-15)**

**A key question** of this overview **is whether the living wage** movement **is an effective policy tool for raising** the **living standards** of the working poor. The answer that I offer, after a fairly exhaustive review of the evidence, is that the movement is beset by a paradox. **By keeping the coverage** of the ordinances quite **limited in terms of the number of workers whose wages are lifted** by the policy, **living wage campaigns are quite effective at quelling officials' concerns regarding economic problems caused by the wage mandate, and**, according to the available evidence, **limited coverage appears not to generate significant inefficiencies.**

Ground is key to fairness since it is the basis on which we make arguments.

2. Grammar:

The Nordquist evidence proves you’re ungrammatical since the resolution is referring to all employers. Grammar precludes, **(a)** the resolution defines the scope of research and what we prepare to debate, an interps that's not semantically consistent with it isn't something we could expect to have to debate. And, outweighs - text of the Rez is the only thing that's equally accessible to everyone since particular articles may be paywalled or obscure. **(b)** the text is the stable basis for clash, arbitrary modifications mean I don’t know which parts he’ll defend. Clash is the biggest link to education since we get critical thinking by engaging arguments, which is the only unique advantage to having a round. **(c)** To affirm means “**to say that something is true.**”[[16]](#footnote-16) Affirmative is contextualized by the resolution, so if he hasn’t linguisticly proven the resolution true he has not affirmed making it nonsensical for the ballot to give the affirmative the win. **And,** precludes topic literature claims since even if more authors interpret a living wage in a different way, that literature isn’t relevant to what the topic is, which is determined by what the resolution means as an English sentence.

3. Limits: You massively underlimit the topic-there are an infinite number of groups of workers you can spec to. Supercharged by the fact that in addition to industries you can specify down to the jurisdiction in which that industry gets a living wage giving you exponentially more plans. Impacts- a) kills predictability, if there are too many affs I can’t predict which one you’ll read, unfair since I need to be able to prepare arguments to win b) kills clash since if there are too many affs I can’t do the prep needed to prepare responses that engage the position, cross apply the impact, outweighs your education args since it doesn’t matter how important discussing the plan is if that discussion is one-sided.

[Frontlines Omitted]

## Employer Can’t Be Government

**A. Interpretation:** The affirmative must defend governments requiring some employer other than themselves to pay a living wage.

**B. Violation:** Doesn’t.

**C. Standards:** 1. Textuality: require is defined as **to impose a compulsion or command on[[17]](#footnote-17).** This implies that the government must be requiring someone other than themselves to do something-you can’t command yourself to take an action, since a command is an order given to someone else, one can’t command oneself to do something, so the government needs to be imposing the requirement on some other employer, not paying the living wage themselves.

Textuality precludes as a litmus test for theory interpretations **(a)** the resolution defines the scope of research and what we prepare to debate, an interps that's not semantically consistent with it isn't something we could expect to have to debate. And, outweighs - text of the Rez is the only thing that's equally accessible to everyone since particular articles may be paywalled or obscure. **(b)** the text is the stable basis for clash, arbitrary modifications mean I don’t know which parts he’ll defend. Clash is the biggest link to education since we get critical thinking by engaging arguments, which is the only unique advantage to having a round. **(c)** To affirm means “**to say that something is true.**”[[18]](#footnote-18) Affirmative is contextualized by the resolution, so if he hasn’t linguistically proven the resolution true he has not affirmed making it nonsensical for the ballot to give the affirmative the win. And,precludes topic literature claims since even if more authors interpret a living wage in a different way, that literature isn’t relevant to what the topic is, which is determined by what the resolution means as an English sentence. Finally,even if he wins that he’s semantically textual, he’s not consistent with common usage. No one says that they are requiring themselves to do something, requirements are always referred to as being imposed by third parties, as in “my teacher requires me to do homework”. Common usage is key to predictability since we expect words to be interpreted as they are used, key to fairness since you need to be able to prepare arguments to win. Lastly, my interpretation is the obvious intention of the resolution. If it was supposed to be about governments paying the living wage, then the phrase “require employers to” would have been omitted-the framers didn’t put it in there for fun. That’s also key to predictability since we expect the resolution to be interpreted as it was intended to be.

2. Ground: You take away tons of core neg ground a) I lose employment ground since if the governments are paying the living wage then they aren’t driven by market forces to lay off workers as companies are. Worse, you can fiat around that if the same actor that requires the living wage hires the workers. That’s key neg ground, it's the single most common argument used against living wages **The Economist ‘14[[19]](#footnote-19)**

**Historically, economists' scepticism was rooted in the worry that wage floors reduce employment**. Firms will hire all the workers it makes sense to hire at prevailing wages, the thinking goes, so any minimum wage that forces firms to pay existing workers more will make those jobs uneconomical, leading to sackings. Yet economists were forced to rethink their views in the early 1990s, when David Card and Alan Krueger of America's National Bureau of Economic Research [presented evidence](http://www.nber.org/papers/w4509) that past minimum-wage increases did not have the expected effect on employment. A rise in New Jersey’s minimum wage did not seem to slow hiring in fast-food restaurants in New Jersey relative to those in neighbouring Pennsylvania, they found. One explanation, some economists speculated, was that firms had previously been getting away with paying workers less than they were able, because workers were prevented from searching for better-paid work by the costs involved in changing jobs. That would mean that when wages were forced up, the firms were able to absorb the costs without firing anyone.

**Academics continue to trade studies on whether minimum wages cost jobs.** **A recent** [**survey**](http://www.igmchicago.org/igm-economic-experts-panel/poll-results?SurveyID=SV_br0IEq5a9E77NMV)**of economists** by the University of Chicago **showed that a narrow** majority of respondents **believe a rise in America’s minimum** wage to $9 per hour **would make it** “noticeably **harder**” for poor workers **to find jobs.**Yet a narrow majority also thought a rise would nonetheless be worthwhile, given the benefits to those who could find work. Economists' opposition to specific minimum-wage hikes is sometimes due to concerns that politicians will impose recklessly high wage-floors, which firms may find difficult to absorb without laying people off. Some economists argue that there is a better alternative in the form of wage subsidies, which cost governments money but do not discourage hiring.

b) You kill core neg framework ground-most of the neg frameworks are based on the idea that the government shouldn’t tell others what to pay-see libertarianism ncs, autonomy negs, and levinas ncs, the three biggest negs on the topic. There are almost no ethical theories that object to the government paying more to people. Also, controls the internal link into philosophical education, if I can’t read the main framework negs on the topic, which are probably the main ones because they are the best, its hard for me to engage in a philosophical debate, that’s key to education since it teaches critical thinking skills and is unique to LD debate. Ground is key to fairness since it's the basis on which we make arguments.

## Must Currently Be Employers

A. Interpretation: The affirmative may only defend a living wage for current employees. The affirmative may not defend paying a living wage to someone who only becomes an employee of the employer as a result of the plan’s enactment.

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Ground: A. you fiat out of unemployment arguments since the people being paid weren’t employees to begin with and thus can’t become newly unemployed. That’s key neg ground, it's the single most common argument used against living wages **The Economist ‘14[[20]](#footnote-20)**

Historically, economists' scepticism was rooted in the worry that wage floors reduce employment. Firms will hire all the workers it makes sense to hire at prevailing wages, the thinking goes, so any minimum wage that forces firms to pay existing workers more will make those jobs uneconomical, leading to sackings. Yet economists were forced to rethink their views in the early 1990s, when David Card and Alan Krueger of America's National Bureau of Economic Research [presented evidence](http://www.nber.org/papers/w4509) that past minimum-wage increases did not have the expected effect on employment. A rise in New Jersey’s minimum wage did not seem to slow hiring in fast-food restaurants in New Jersey relative to those in neighbouring Pennsylvania, they found. One explanation, some economists speculated, was that firms had previously been getting away with paying workers less than they were able, because workers were prevented from searching for better-paid work by the costs involved in changing jobs. That would mean that when wages were forced up, the firms were able to absorb the costs without firing anyone.

Academics continue to trade studies on whether minimum wages cost jobs. A recent [survey](http://www.igmchicago.org/igm-economic-experts-panel/poll-results?SurveyID=SV_br0IEq5a9E77NMV) of economists by the University of Chicago showed that a narrow majority of respondents believe a rise in America’s minimum wage to $9 per hour would make it “noticeably harder” for poor workers to find jobs. Yet a narrow majority also thought a rise would nonetheless be worthwhile, given the benefits to those who could find work. Economists' opposition to specific minimum-wage hikes is sometimes due to concerns that politicians will impose recklessly high wage-floors, which firms may find difficult to absorb without laying people off. Some economists argue that there is a better alternative in the form of wage subsidies, which cost governments money but do not discourage hiring.

B. Your interp allows for obviously true affs such as a requirement to pay people currently unpaid in modern day slavery, meaning my ground is terrible since I’m forced to justify these people remaining slaves instead of receiving income, which in addition to being nearly impossible forces me to be discursively offensive.

2. Limits: You massively underlimit the topic since now you not only get typical affs calling for a pay raise but you can make literally any individual that is not currently a paid employee an employee. There are a nearly infinite number of groups not urrently employed that this gives this access to. Limits are key to fairness - ensures equal research burdens and division of ground and key to education - incentivizes topical research and depth of education.

3. Textuality: a) The people paying the living wage are not employers since the people you pay are not yet employees. This means the plan is fx topical at best, since they only become employers as a result of the plan’s enactment. No semantics about how they employee other people, employers is contextualized by the specific individuals we are discussing. *Even though universities hire professors, they are not employers in the context of a plan to pay student athletes until the plan is enacted, so you are no more topical than if the plan was food providers should pay a living wage to athletes since universities also happen to provide food.* B) Living is an adjective that modifies the word wage, so we are questioning whether the wage should be a living one. This means the resolution textually assumes a comparison to some other wage employees are currently receiving, so you can’t defend someone not now an employee. If I say “the cafeteria should make good food” I am not discussing whether they should make food at all, since they have to make food no matter what, but whether that food should be of high quality. Textuality precludes as a litmus test for theory interpretations **(a)** the resolution defines the scope of research and what we prepare to debate, an interps that's not semantically consistent with it isn't something we could expect to have to debate. And, outweighs - text of the Rez is the only thing that's equally accessible to everyone since particular articles may be paywalled or obscure. **(b)** the text is the stable basis for clash, arbitrary modifications mean I don’t know which parts he’ll defend. Clash is the biggest link to education since we get critical thinking by engaging arguments, which is the only unique advantage to having a round. **(c)** To affirm means “**to say that something is true.**”[[21]](#footnote-21) Affirmative is contextualized by the resolution, so if he hasn’t linguistically proven the resolution true he has not affirmed making it nonsensical for the ballot to give the affirmative the win. And,precludes topic literature claims since even if more authors interpret a living wage in a different way, that literature isn’t relevant to what the topic is, which is determined by what the resolution means as an English sentence.

# T-Living Wage

## Applicability

### Just Contractors/Subcontractors

**[Ommitted]**

### Not Prisoners

**[Ommited]**

## Amount

### Enough to live on

**A. Interpretation:** Aff must defend employers are required to give compensation to workers that ensures a decent living standard, which is the living wage. **Anker 13[[22]](#footnote-22)**

**Living wage is: Remuneration received** for a standard work week **by a worker in a particular place sufficient to afford a decent standard of living for the worker** **and** her or his **family. Elements of a decent standard of living include food, water, housing, education, health care, transport, clothing, and other essential needs**, including provision for unexpected events.

**B. Violation:** The wage needed varies—national scale ***does not*** meet a living wage and 130 isn't enough. **Foster-Bey et al. 01** [[23]](#footnote-23)

The decision to define a living wage as the official poverty level for a family of four can be criticized on several grounds. First, many view **the official poverty level** as **too low for a family to achieve a minimally decent standard of living** these days. As a result, it's possible to argue that **the cutoff for a living wage should be** set at **150** percent of the poverty level **or even** as high as **200 percent of the poverty level**. The official poverty level was chosen as a conservative measure for this paper. **Most** people would **agree that a decent job is one that** at the very least **enables a breadwinner to keep a family of four out of poverty** as officially defined. Second, wherever the earnings cutoff is set will be somewhat arbitrary, with families a bit above and a bit below being in essentially the same economic circumstances. Analysis requires specificity, however. Any numerical cutoff is no more arbitrary than any other in this sense is, because income is measured on a continuum. Third and more fundamentally, **a single national standard does not take into account differences in local costs of living.** It seems fair to assume that **the cost of living in New York** City **is different from that in Jackson**, Mississippi, in which case a single earnings standard will understate a living wage in Jackson and overstate it in New York. Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW), a Washington, D.C.based advocacy organization, has attempted to address this issue by developing **a cost-of-living based, self-sufficiency wage** standard. This selfsufficiency wage **is calculated by producing a minimum budgets for different family types** that allows the family to maintain itself without public subsidies. The self-sufficiency wage is attractive conceptually. But it is difficult to use in quantitative comparative studies across multiple jurisdictions. In addition to being computationally complex, the fact that the data are derived from a mix of local, state, regional, and national sources makes it unclear that the resulting self-sufficiency wage does in fact provide unbiased comparisons across labor markets.6 At least the direction of **the regional bias in the national poverty standard is relatively clear.**

**C. Standards:**

1. Precision: My definition is most precise since it's consistent with the meaning of the two words in living wage. It is a wage that allows one to live. Other definitions conflate a living wage with things such as a higher minimum wage. Prefer mine since terms of art are derived based on the meanings of the words that make them up. Precision is key – a vague topic means that what counts as a topical aff is indeterminate, impedes preround prep and clash once we have to debate them.

2. Real World. My definition describes real world living wages. Prefer my evidence since it's an extensive survey. **Anker 2**

**The six sustainability standard systems have agreed** **to the** following **definition** of living wage. **This definition** succinctly **incorporates the main characteristics of living wage found in over 60 living wage descriptions and definitions from human rights declarations, national constitutions, NGO,** multinational and **corporate codes of conduct, ILO documents, and statements of major historical figures**, Popes **and the Catholic Church** (Anker 2011).

Real world is key to a) education since it ensures that the arguments we make have actual meaning and are not empty claims only relevant in a contrived debate and b) predictability since the most logical assumption to prepare based on is that a living wage will be interpreted as it actually exists, key to fairness since winning is impossible absent the ability to prepare arguments. And, controls the internal link into topic lit claims a) most authors talk about living wages as they exist in the real world, so most of the lit will be about my definition and b) even if there is some lit that uses other definition that isn’t the relevant lit since actual politicians don’t reference it when they reference a living wage since to them a living wage is based on my definition.

3. Neg ground: Core neg ground relies on large increase to the minimum wage. For example, unemployment is at the core of neg lit but I don’t get a link to it unless there is a substantial enough increase in pay to trigger layoffs. My disads rely on a brink that is only triggered by a somewhat large increase while yours don’t-you garner some benefit just from every extra cent low-income workers get. Ground is key to fairness because debaters must be able to access offense on all layers of the flow.

### Area-Specific

**A. Interpretation:** Living wage is based on cost of living but takes into account specific geographic area. **LWAC ‘06**[[24]](#footnote-24)

A living wage is a decent wage. It affords the earner and her or his family the most basic costs of living without need for government support or poverty programs. With a living wage an individual can take pride in her work and enjoy the decency of a life beyond poverty, beyond an endless cycle of working and sleeping, beyond the ditch of poverty wages. A living wage is a complete consideration of the cost of living. Wages vary according to location, as costs of living vary. A living wage in rural Louisiana is around $9.33, while in Washington, DC it's closer to $15 an hour. (learn how to calculate a living wage here: Living Wage 101) A living wage as opposed to the federal poverty line, takes into account the many necessary factors in calculating the actual costs in a specific geographic area. Both the Economic Policy Institute’s “Basic Family Budget” and Wider Opportunities for Women’s “Self Sufficiency Standard” use thorough research into the seven components of the cost of living to arrive at similar minimum incomes. You would do best to read the two organizations’ own descriptions and detail of their data and approach, but both are summarized here.

`

**B. Violation:** The aff defends a fixed dollar amount.

**C. Standards:**

1. Textual precision: The phrase living wage implies that it is a wage necessary to live. Since the cost of living various around the country and world, the amount of income needed varies too, meaning so should the term living wage. Precision is key to predictability, otherwise we have no idea how the words will be interpreted, key ot fairness since you need to be able to prepare arguments to win. Uniquely key at Blake since it’s the first one on the topic, all we’ve seen is the text of the resolution.

2. Real world- in the real world there is not a fixed definition of living wage-instead it varies based on the cost of living of different countries **Guzi ‘13[[25]](#footnote-25)**

The income level necessary to secure a decent standard of living is an important economic yardstick of income adequacy. A living wage is defined as a wage paid for a standard working week that meets the basic needs of workers and their families and provides some discretionary income. The need for a living wage has also been recognized by the international community. In 1919 the International Labor Organization (ILO) has defined a living wage as a basic human right under their conventions and recommendations to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 23 (ILO, 2008). In 1948 the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights officially recognized the need for workers to receive a living wage. There was never a consensus on how to define a living wage but in the recent decades governments, municipalities, international and local trade unions, and labor research institutes developed their own definitions and measurement methods of a living wage. Debates have appeared in different fora about how best to calculate this standard in a given context. Anker (2011) is the most comprehensive review on how the living wage has been described, defined and measured around the world. In many countries, the concept of living wage is based on a number of different definitions. Different methodological approaches make it difficult to produce a globally comparable living wage. Moreover, the estimation of living wage hinges on the availability of timely information about the cost of living, which is seldom available in developing countries. Anker (2011) argues that greater clarity with regards to the definition and measurement of living wage is a prerequisite for the widespread consideration of living wages and employee needs, by companies, unions and governments.

Real world is key to education since otherwise our knowledge is useless since it can only be applied to a debate round.

3. Framer’s intent: If the framers wanted the debate to be about a specific amount of money, they would have put a number in the resolution. There’s clearly a reason they didn’t-because they want the term to be variable. Framers intent provides the best interps since the resolution was written by experienced coaches who know better than us what is fair and educational.

### Federal Poverty Line ($11.06/hr)

**A. Interpretation**- A living wage is defined as a wage that would allow a family to reach the federal poverty line. Neumark and Adams[[26]](#footnote-26):

The feature common to all living wage ordinances is a minimum wage requirement that is higher—and often much higher—than the traditional minimum wages set by state and federal legislation. These wage requirements are typically linked to definitions of family poverty. Many ordinances explicitly peg a wage to the level needed for a family to reach the federal poverty line (for example, Milwaukee, San Jose, and St. Paul). Thus, when the federal government defines new poverty lines each year, the living wages in these cities increase. Other localities set an initial wage that is increased annually to take into account increases in the cost of living (for example, Los Angeles and Oakland). Although these latter ordinances may not explicitly state the basis for setting the initial wage, poverty is undoubtedly an underlying factor

**B. Violation:** A living wage would need to be at least 11.06 dollars per hour **Huffington Post ‘13[[27]](#footnote-27)**

The federal minimum wage of $7.25 is worth $2 less today than it was in 1968 when adjusted for inflation. That's one of the findings in a June study by the non-partisan Economic Policy Institute on the economic position of Blacks in America. Today, the minimum wage, which hasn't increased since 2009, falls short of a living wage. According to the EPI study, a full-time worker would need to earn $11.06 an hour in 2011 to keep a family of four out of poverty. The real value of the minimum wage peaked in 1968, when it was $1.60.

C: **Standards**

1. Field context: Neumark and Adams are leading authors in the lit for this topic. They’ve done numerous studies on the living wage, and are cited in numerous more. Further, they are doing a survey of the topic and looking at various real world examples, not just writing their own opinionated article, so their evidence is a better indicator of the overall field context. Field context is key to fairness because it controls how we understand and research ground on the topic and key to education because it allows us to learn about the real arguments authors make.
2. Ground – Core neg ground relies on large increase to the minimum wage. For example, unemployment is at the core of neg lit but I don’t get a link to it unless there is a substantial enough increase in pay to trigger layoffs. My disads rely on a brink that is only triggered by a somewhat large increase while yours don’t-you garner some benefit just from every extra cent low-income workers get. Ground is key to fairness because debaters must be able to access offense on all layers of the flow.
3. My interp is least arbitrary. The federal poverty line is a common benchmark for the amount of money needed to live ones everyday life. The fact that that number is used a lot in policy making indicates its an accepted standard. This means a) my interp is more predictable since it’s a commonly used number we can prepare for, key to fairness you need to be able to prepare arguments to win b) any other interp is arbitrary-any author could make up her own number. That’s unfair since you can pick whichever number works best for your ac. And, your number having been implemented somewhere as a minimum doesn’t make it predictable since lots of different minimum wages exist that a) aren’t necesarrily living wages and b) are all different making it unpredictable.

# T-Ought

## Parameters

Ought is defined as an evaluation of utility. **Harris[[28]](#footnote-28)**

If this notion of **“ought”** means anything we can possibly care about, it **must translate into a concern about the actual** or potential **experience of conscious beings** (either in this life or in some other). For instance, **to say** that **we ought to treat** children **with kindness seems identical to saying that everyone will tend to be better off if we do.** The person who claims that he does not want to be better off is either wrong about what he does, in fact, want (i.e., he doesn’t know what he’s missing), or he is lying, or he is not making sense. The person who insists that he is committed to treating children with kindness for reasons that have nothing to do with anyone’s well-being is also not making sense. It is worth noting in this context that the God of Abraham never told us to treat children with kindness, but He did tell us to kill them for talking back to us (Exodus 21:15, Leviticus 20:9, Deuteronomy 21:18–21, Mark 7:9–13, and Matthew 15:4–7). And yet everyone finds this “moral” imperative perfectly insane. Which is to say that no one—not even fundamentalist[s] Christians and orthodox Jews—can so fully ignore the link between morality and human well-being.

Prefer Harris:

1. Ground. Util includes all impacts and compares them based on objective weighing standards meaning 0 ground loss while other frameworks excludes certain impacts on a normative level and skew ground towards one side even if these positions are structurally turnable. Util side bias is empirically denied by good args on both sides, such as reducing poverty and unemployment . Ground key to fairness since it determines access to the ballot and controls the internal link to all other fairness standards because they all appeal to some conception of unequal offense which ground determines.

B. Topic Literature: Real literature centers on living wage’s effects as a policy. **Zatz ‘09[[29]](#footnote-29)**

The thrust of arguments such as Daniel Shaviro’s is that even if the minimum wage attempts to address a real problem, it does so in a way that is clearly inferior to feasible institutional alternatives—some form of cash transfer funded out of general tax revenues—and possibly counterproductive.11 Arguments like Shaviro’s have become hegemonic, in the sense that counterarguments largely remain within the same terms of debate while seeking to eke out a victory nonetheless.12 **Arguments for the minimum wage marshal evidence that more low-income workers are helped** than the critics charge; fewer jobs are lost; the alternatives have their problems, too; and so on.Spirited as this debate is, it is remarkably narrow. Both sides basically agree that the minimum wage should be evaluated as an antipoverty program; they disagree merely about how the policy fares under that rubric. Supporters insist that “if you work, then you shouldn’t be poor,”14 and opponents counter that minimum wage regulation can undermine that goal by causing job loss and that tax-and-transfer programs like the **Earned Income Tax Credit (“**EITC**”)** can more efficiently target low-income workers. Notably, supporters largely have given up on alternative arguments grounded in notions of employer exploitation or superior bargaining power that once held more sway.15

Even if other arguments are made, Zatz indicates that those are at the fringes-the main arguments being advocated are all consequentialist. Topic lit is key to education since we learn by researching arguments and to fairness since can only predict arguments we find them in core of the lit, key since we need to prepare arguments to win.

C. Topic Education: I’m better for topic education since I ensure the whole debate is about the living wage instead of largely being about abstract philosophy not contextualized in terms of the topic. There is always a tradeoff, so saying we should have abstract framework and topic debate is non-responsive. Topic Education outweighs philosophical education a) this is literally our last chance to learn about the topic, while we can get phil ed any time b) this is TOC, we’ve gotten phil ed since we’ve both been successful debaters for years, so your phil ed benefits are irrelevant since framework debates are all the same and we can’t learn something we already know. Meanwhile, we’ve only debated the topic for two months c) its more relevant-knowing abstract philosophy can’t change the world but congress actually debates issues such as the topic. Also, I’m better for phil ed since they can go for why side-constraints are utility maximizing or why fostering virtue maximizes utility, which promotes better philosophical clash on specific issues rather than just generic 10 point dumps that yield 0 phil ed.

# Both Sides

## Must Clarify Minimum or Living Wage Evidence (Both Sides)

**[Ommited]**

# 1AR Shells

## Neg Must Spec Squo

[Ommited]

## Neg May not defend increase in minimum wage

**A. Interpretation:** The negative may not defend an increase in the minimum wage.

**B. Violation:** He does.

**C. Standards:** 1. Philosophy education You kill phil ed because no philosophy justifies a 12 but not a 15 dollar minimum wage. While one might be slightly better under the aff framework, there’s no way that the neg framework would uniquely justify the cp. This kills the incentive to have a framework debate, since the debate becomes about pedantic details of implementation instead of a philosophical debate about the benefits of living wage laws. Phil education is key since it forces debaters to discuss complex ethical ideas, encouraging higher level critical thinking. **Also,** philosophical education only exists in LD debate since other formats presume utility so his interp uniquely destroys an avenue to learn about moral theories. Finally, phil education precludes other education arguments because philosophy teaches us what is valuable, so even if we can make good decisions with other education, we won’t make ethically valuable ones.

2. The core of the lit isn’t about exactly how much we raise the minimum wage-its about the idea of doing it at all **Benassi ‘11**[[30]](#footnote-30)

Because of its potential redistributive effect, setting a minimum wage as a matter of policy is a contentious political issue and object of controversies among the government, workers’ organizations and employers. Despite (or because of?) the controversy, there still lacks a coherent debate about effective minimum wage implementation strategies. A review of academic literature reveals the same gap in the research: the minimum wage issue is widely debated as a matter of policy, but its implementation is often left out. Some authors deal with the question of legitimacy of minimum wage from a philosophical and legal perspective, discussing the minimum wage in reference to the ideal of social justice and of civil rights in different societi[y]es (Levin-Waldman 2009; Gaski 2004).

This means a) you’re cp is unpredictable because the literature isn’t about specifics so I had no way to predict a cp that changes implementation slightly, key to fairness since you need to prepare arguments to win and b) key to education since we’ll learn about the best arguments by reading the ones at the core, not the fringes, of the literature.

3. Strategy: a) you’re counterplan focuses the entire debate on the amount the minimum wage is being increased rather than whether it should be increased, while my aff had to also justify why it should be raised at all. This gives you a massive strategic advantage since you can moot much of the AC and focus you’re whole speech on what will matter b) since there are many different interps of living wage I’m in a double bind-either I defend the one you want me to and run this pic or you run t, either way giving you a preclusive strat that advantages you. C) I have to pick a framework to read in the AC so he can pick whether increasing more or less than I do is best under that framework. A living wage is some where in the middle, but probably not the best under any framework-for example giving everyone 30 dollars an hour is better under a poverty framework while a smaller increase is better under different frameworks. Outweighs because if he can make the increase anything after I’ve chosen a framework I’ll lose literally every round since he can always pick the cp that’s better under my framework. Strategy is key to fairness since is how we generate paths to the ballot. And, I don’t kill your cp ground-you can run a cp as long as its not an increase in the minimum wage. Solves the offense to my interp while giving you cps.

## UBI/EITCetc.. bad

A. Interpretation: The negative may only defend either the status quo or a competitive employment policy. To clarify, the negative may not defend a different type of economic policy such as a tax policy or transfer payment.

B. Violation: UBI is a transfer payment, not an employment policy.

C. Standards:

1. ground a) They give the neg quantitatively more ground. They get various transfer payments, changes in the tax code, as well as different wage policies while I only get living wage. Maybe this is fine in policy debate where there are many possible plans but certainly not in LD where every aff is a variation on one policy.

b) This gives the neg infinitely many advantage counterplans that solve poverty, meaning the negative will always be ahead since at best I can weigh a small solvency deficit against disads that I can’t solve with my advocacy since doing so would be intrinsic, uniquely advantaging the neg.

Ground is key to fairness since it's the basis on which we make arguments.

*2. Skews research burdens since I can’t prepare against every single argument in the literature that’s consistent with my AC, whereas he knows what I have to defend. Uniquely bad a) most of the authors in the literature defend policy options that directly contrast with the living wage, b) there’s no reason why research on the aff would interact with a non-mutually exclusive counterplan that happens to also solve for poverty outside of pure chance because authors rarely compare advantages or disads of the two simultaneously. Key to fairness because it ensures both debaters did the same work to win the round and key to education by ensuring equal research on all relevant issues.*

3. Strategy. Since in LD the aff is forced to pick a framework the neg can pick which ever cp is best under my framework. I’m always screwed because a living wage is somewhere in the middle, so under a framework where further left policies are good I’ll lose to UBI and under a framework where further right policies are good I’ll lose to a free market cp. Outweighs other abuse because I’ll lose literally every round if the neg can always have an advocacy that’s better under my framework.

4. Real world policy making. A real policy maker would simply vote yes/no on living wage, not whether the living wage is better than an unrelated policy **McKinney ‘91** explains why simulating a policy maker means fiating your cp makes no sense**[[31]](#footnote-31)**

Perhaps the most sophisticated objection to intrinsicness that 1 have heard was passed along to me by Roger Solt The crux of this argument is that the proper analogy for debate is not that of Congress voting yes or no to the affirmative plan, but that of one congressman deciding whether to endorse the affirmative plan. If the debate is, as Roger postulates, the decision of a lone Congressman, then the intrinsicness answer provides no comfort to the Congressman since he has no guarantee that if he votes for the affirmative plan, the necessary additional measures will also be adopted. Such an objection would invalidate affirmative intrinsicness of all types, whether topical or not.While novel, this protest fails as well. 1 see no justification for the basic premise that the debate should be seen through the eyes of a single congressman. If the congressman paradigm were accepted, it would invalidate all counterplans with one fell swoop. A competitive counterplan that is more desirable than the affirmative plan provides a reason to reject the affirmative plan because it demonstrates that adopting the affirmative is unwise since to do so would preclude [of] the adoption of a superior alternative (the counterplan). If the debate were seen as the decision of a single policymaker with less than absolute authority, a judge would never vote negative on a counterplan unless he thought the counterplan was likely to be adopted by the present system lest he forgo the desirable affirmative plan in lieu of the counterplan which might never be adopted. A counterplan without fiat, as would be the case under the congressman paradigm, would no longer be a counterplan but a mere disadvantage. Suffice it to say that any paradigm which destroys the counterplan should be rejected outright for reasons which are solid but do not belong in this article.

Policy making education is key **Keller**:[[32]](#footnote-32)

**Policy practice encompasses** social workers' "**efforts to** influence the development, enactment, implementation, or **assess**ment of **social policies**" (Jansson, 1994, p. 8). **Effective policy practice involves** analytic activities, such asdefining issues, gathering data, conducting research,identifying and **prioritizing** policy **options, and creating policy proposals** (Jansson, 1994). It also involves persuasive activities intended to influence opinions and outcomes, such as discussing and debating issues, organizing coalitions and task forces, and providing testimony. According to Jansson (1984, pp. 57-58), social workers rely upon five fundamental skills when pursuing policy practice activities:     \* value-clarification skills for identifying and assessing the underlying values inherent in policy positions;     \* conceptual skills for identifying and evaluating the relative merits of different policy options;     \* interactional skills for interpreting the values and positions of others and conveying one's own point of view in a convincing manner;     \* political skills for developing coalitions and developing effective strategies; and     **\* position-taking skills for** recommending, **advocating,** and defending **a particular policy.** These policy practice skills **reflect the hallmarks of critical thinking** (see Brookfield, 1987; Gambrill, 1997). **The central activities of critical thinking are identifying and challenging underlying assumptions, exploring alternative[s]** ways of thinking and acting, **and arriving at commitments after a period of** questioning, **analysis,** and reflection (Brookfield, 1987). Significant parallels exist with the policy-making process--identifying the values underlying policy choices, recognizing and evaluating multiple alternatives, and taking a position and advocating for its adoption. **Developing policy practice skills** seems to **share[s] much in common with developing** capacities for **critical thinking.**

[Frontlines Omitted]

## Wage Subsidies Bad

**A. Interpretation:** The negative may not defend employees receiving the amount of money that constitutes a living wage as a result of their work. To clarify, the negative may not read a counterplan such as wage subsidies in which the government pays them because they are employees but the negative may read, say, UBI.

**B. Violation:** He reads a wage subsidies cp.

**C. Standards:**

1. Ground: a) The neg coopts the entirety of the aff-most of the benefit of affirming is workers receiving more money, that’s why living wages are implemented – but the cp does that too, taking away all my ground. The neg will always be ahead since any disad becomes game over b) The negs ground is qualitatively better because the neg can fiat out of a lot of the disads to the aff. Enforcement isn’t an issue when the government subsidises the wage instead of employers paying it and he fiats out of coercion arguments since the cp definitionally doesn’t coerce employers to pay more money. C) He has quantitatively more ground. I am forced to defend employers paying the wage while he has infinitely many actors-federal governemtn, local governments, NGOs, etc… Ground is key to fairness since it's the basis on which we make arguments.

2. Strat: The cp skews my strat since its functionally a pic that pics out of the employer. Even if have a mechanism debate of minimum wage vs wage subsidy would be fair in the abstract the structure of a debate round makes it unfair. I’m forced to spend most of the AC establishing the need for employees to receive higher pay, so he’ll always be ahead if he can devote his entire speech to someone else paying being net preferable. Further, solving poverty advantages with a cp like this one skews my strategy since I can’t do the same to his disads or I’d be intrinsic. Maybe that is ok in policy to compensate for many vastly different affs, but not in LD where every aff is a living wage so he can read this cp every round. Strat is key to fairness since debaters need to be able to execute a path to the ballot to win.
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